

PATENT

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated August 10, 2005. Claims 1-37 were examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Final Office Action states that the term 'can be' or 'can' are relative terms that render the claims indefinite. Applicants respectfully point the Examiner to at least the specification, beginning at page 31, line 16, which provides a standard for determining the scope of the claim. See MPEP § 2173.05. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 7, 18, 28, 31, and 37 and all claims dependent thereon, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 8-16, 31, 32, 35, and 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Grant et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,218,602). Regarding independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully maintain that Grant, alone or in combination with other references of record, fails to teach or suggest that

for a particular transfer, the arbitration logic is coupled to receive an indication from a particular target node for the particular transfer as to whether the particular transfer can be supported in the particular target node,

as recited by claim 1. The Final Office Action relies on col. 10, line 59, to col. 11, line 19 of Grant to supply this teaching. This portion of Grant teaches that "[s]ervice requests read from new request queue 155 are honored only if both the originator and the server node addresses, which are contained in the request, correspond to idle nodes, as determined by node status memory 154" (col. 11, lines 9-13, emphasis added). Grant teaches further that

## PATENT

[a] node status memory 154, organized as a RAM, contains a busy-or-idle status of each node. A node is 'busy' if CC98 has already established a connection for that node during the current frame, and has subsequently stored that connection command in connect buffer 158. A node is 'idle' if no connection for that node has yet been established by CC 98 during the current frame

(col. 11, lines 34-41, emphasis added). The connection controller, CC98, of Grant determines whether or not a node is busy or idle based on connections made by CC98 to that node. This status of the node is stored in the node status memory of Grant, which is part of the connection controller (see FIG. 12). The connection controller, CC98, of Grant does not receive an indication from a particular target node for the particular transfer as to whether the particular transfer can be supported in the particular target node. Nowhere does Grant teach or suggest arbitration logic coupled to receive an indication from a particular target node for the particular transfer as to whether the particular transfer can be supported in the particular target node. Thus, Applicants maintain that claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding independent claim 18, Applicants respectfully maintain that Grant, alone or in combination with other references of record, fails to teach or suggest

requesting a path through the network from the initiator node to the target node during an arbitration stage from arbitration logic, the arbitration logic communicating with the target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from the initiator node.

The Final Office Action relies on col. 10, line 59, to col. 11, line 19 of Grant to supply this teaching. This portion of Grant teaches that "[s]ervice requests read from new request queue 155 are honored only if both the originator and the server node addresses, which are contained in the request, correspond to idle nodes, as determined by node status memory 154" (col. 11, lines 9-13, emphasis added). Grant teaches further that

## PATENT

[a] node status memory 154, organized as a RAM, contains a busy-or-idle status of each node. A node is 'busy' if CC98 has already established a connection for that node during the current frame, and has subsequently stored that connection command in connect buffer 158. A node is 'idle' if no connection for that node has yet been established by CC 98 during the current frame

(col. 11, lines 34-41, emphasis added). The connection controller, CC98, of Grant determines whether or not a node is busy or idle based on connections made by CC98 to that node. This status of the node is stored in the node status memory of Grant, which is part of the connection controller (see FIG. 12). The connection controller, CC98, of Grant does not communicate with the target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from the initiator node. Nowhere does Grant teach or suggest arbitration logic communicating with the target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from the initiator node, as claimed. For at least this reason Applicants maintain that claim 18 is allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 18 and all claims dependent thereon, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding claim 31, Applicants respectfully maintain that Grant, alone or in combination with other references of record, fails to teach or suggest that

during the arbitration stage, arbitration logic communicates with a target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from an initiator node.

The Final Office Action relies on col. 10, line 59, to col. 11, line 19 of Grant to supply this teaching. This portion of Grant teaches that "[s]ervice requests read from new request queue 155 are honored only if both the originator and the server node addresses, which are contained in the request, correspond to idle nodes, as determined by node status memory 154" (col. 11, lines 9-13, emphasis added). Grant teaches further that

[a] node status memory 154, organized as a RAM, contains a busy-or-idle status of each node. A node is 'busy' if CC98 has already established a connection for that node during the current frame, and has subsequently stored that connection command in connect buffer 158. A node is 'idle' if no connection for that node has yet been established by CC 98 during the current frame

## PATENT

(col. 11, lines 34-41, emphasis added). The connection controller, CC98, of Grant determines whether or not a node is busy or idle based on connections made by CC98 to that node. This status of the node is stored in the node status memory of Grant, which is part of the connection controller (see FIG. 12). The connection controller, CC98, of Grant does not communicate with the target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from the initiator node. Nowhere does Grant teach or suggest that arbitration logic communicates with a target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from an initiator node, as claimed. For at least this reason Applicants maintain that claim 31 is allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 31 and all claims dependent thereon, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

*Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103*

Claims 17, 33, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant in view of Lam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,027). Applicants believe that claims 17, 33, and 34 depend from allowable claims and are allowable for at least this reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 17, 33, and 34, be withdrawn.

Claims 18, 19, 22, 27, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant in view Kumar (U.S. No. Patent 6,122,274). Regarding claim 18, Applicants respectfully maintain that Grant, alone or in combination with other references of record, fails to teach or suggest

requesting a path through the network from the initiator node to the target node during an arbitration stage from arbitration logic, the arbitration logic communicating with the target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from the initiator node,

as recited by claim 18. The Final Office Action relies on col. 10, line 59, to col. 11, line 19 of Grant to supply this teaching. This portion of Grant teaches that “[s]ervice requests read from new request queue 155 are honored only if both the originator and the server node addresses,

## PATENT

which are contained in the request, correspond to idle nodes, as determined by node status memory 154" (col. 11, lines 9-13, emphasis added). Grant teaches further that

[a] node status memory 154, organized as a RAM, contains a busy-or-idle status of each node. A node is 'busy' if CC98 has already established a connection for that node during the current frame, and has subsequently stored that connection command in connect buffer 158. A node is 'idle' if no connection for that node has yet been established by CC 98 during the current frame

(col. 11, lines 34-41, emphasis added). The connection controller, CC98, of Grant determines whether or not a node is busy or idle based on connections made by CC98 to that node. This status of the node is stored in the node status memory of Grant, which is part of the connection controller (see FIG. 12). The connection controller, CC98, of Grant does not communicate with the target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from the initiator node.

Kumar fails to compensate for the shortcomings of Grant. Kumar teaches a data packet switch that employs physically separate memory modules and operates like a single shared memory switch (Abstract). Nowhere does Grant, alone or in combination with Kumar, teach or suggest arbitration logic communicating with the target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from the initiator node, as claimed. For at least this reason Applicants maintain that claim 18 is allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 18 and all claims dependent thereon, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant and Kumar as applied to claims 18, 19 and 22 above, and further in view of Lam (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,027). Applicants believe that claims 23 and 24 depend from allowable claims and are allowable for at least this reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 23 and 24 be withdrawn.

*Allowable Subject Matter*


Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 7, 28, and 29. Applicants believe that these claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 6, 20, 21, 25, and 26. Applicants believe that claims 6, 20, 21, 25, and 26 depend from allowable claims and are allowable for at least this reason.

PATENT

Summary

Claims 1-37 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

<b><u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION</u></b>	
I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being	
<input type="checkbox"/> deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed as shown above.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.	
 Nicole Teitler Cave	<u>10/7/05</u> Date

Respectfully submitted,



Nicole Teitler Cave, Reg. No. 54,021

Attorney for Applicant(s)

(512) 338-6315 (direct)

(512) 338-6300 (main)

(512) 338-6301 (fax)

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: \_\_\_\_\_